

Examiner states that the sheet structure of the instantly claimed imaging member bears no resemblance to a wheel or pipe shaft. The Examiner states that the applicant is claiming a term contrary to its ordinary meaning so as to not put one skilled in the art on notice as to the meaning of the claim. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner is utilizing much too narrow a definition for "flange". The Examiner's attention is directed to the attached definitions from the Cambridge Advanced Learners Dictionary and the MSN Encarta Dictionary. These definitions set forth "flange" as a flat surface on the surface of an object making an object stronger. This clearly is within the meaning intended by the instant claims. The sheet flange of the invention makes the foam core stronger. The sheet flange of the invention is a flat surface sticking out from the object that makes the object stronger. The Examiner's interpretation that a flange must be on a wheel or pipe shaft is much too narrow. For instance, the common I beam is ordinarily referred to as having flanges. Therefore, the applicant respectfully urges that the use of the term flange is within the dictionary definitions and that the applicants may be their own lexicographers and properly utilize the word in the claims as set forth. It is respectfully requested that this rejection under 35 USC 112 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejections under 35 USC 112 and under obviousness-type double patenting be reconsidered and withdrawn and that an early Notice of Allowance be issued in this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul A. Leipold
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 26,664

Paul A. Leipold/rgd
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-722-5023
Facsimile: 585-477-1148